

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Applicant originally submitted Claims 1-20 in the application. In a previous response, the Applicant amended Claims 1, 6-10, 12, 14-17 and 19-20, Claim 2 was canceled without prejudice or disclaimer and no claims were added. In the present response, the Applicant has not amended, canceled, or added any claims. Accordingly, Claims 1 and 3-20 are currently pending in the application.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1 and 4-7 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0110476 by Aihara (hereinafter "Aihara") in view of an article entitled, "Visualizing Application Behavior on Superscalar Processors," IEEE, 10/1999 by Stolte, *et al.* (hereinafter "Stolte"). The Applicant respectfully disagrees since the combination of Aihara with Stolte, as applied by the Examiner, does not render obvious independent Claim 1.

The Examiner recognizes that Aihara does not explicitly teach that a screen comprises a graphical user interface (GUI) for receiving user input to select one of the instruction address and asserts that Stolte cures this deficiency of Aihara because Stolte teaches a pipeline visualization system that includes a GUI for user manipulation of the pipeline instructions. (See Examiner's Action of July 24, 2008, page 2.) Stolte does not teach or suggest a GUI for receiving user input to select one of the instruction address as recited in independent Claim 1. Stolte teaches a timeline view of execution that a user can zoom in on to show view a large number of cycles of instructions. Additionally, Stolte teaches a pipeline view which can be animated to observe instructions as they

travel through the pipeline. Lastly, Stolte teaches a source code view which correlates pipeline behavior with an application's source code. Thus, Stolte enables a user to zoom in on a set or range of instructions to see how they progress through a pipeline, but Stolte does not teach or suggest a GUI that allows a user to select one of the instruction addresses as presently claimed.

As such, Stolte, as applied by the Examiner, does not cure the deficiencies of Aihara and therefore, the combination does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 1 and 4-7 and allow issuance thereof.

II. Rejection of Claims 8-10 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 8-10 and 12-15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,913,052 to Beatty, *et al.* (hereinafter "Beatty"), and further in view Stolte. As established above, the combination of Aihara and Stolte does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 1. Analogously, the cited combination of Aihara and Stolte does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 8 since Claim 8 also includes the limitation of a GUI that allows a user to select a particular instruction address. Additionally, as established on pages 10-13 in the response of April 28, 2008, the combination of Aihara and Beatty does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 8. For at least these reasons, the cited combination of Aihara, Beatty, and Stolte does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 8 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claims 8-10 and 12-15 and allow issuance thereof.

III. Rejection of Claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 16-20 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of Beatty. As established above, the cited combination of Aihara and Beatty does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 8. Analogously, for the same reasons, the cited combination does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 16 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the §103 rejection of Claims 16-20 and allow issuance thereof.

IV. Rejection of Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 3 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of Stolte, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0130871 by Hill, *et al.* (hereinafter "Hill"). As established above, the cited combination of Aihara and Stolte does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 1. Hill has not been cited to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination of Aihara and Stolte but to teach a pop-up window. As such, the cited combination of Aihara, Stolte, and Hill does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness of independent Claim 1 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 3 and allow issuance thereof.

V. Rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103

The Examiner has rejected Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aihara in view of Beatty, further in view Stolte, and still further in view of Hill. As established

above, the cited combination of Aihara, Beatty, and Stolte does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 8. Hill has not been cited to cure the above-noted deficiencies of the cited combination of Aihara, Beatty, and Stolte but to teach a pop-up window. As such, the cited combination of Aihara, Beatty, Stolte, and Hill does not provide a *prima facie* case of obviousness for independent Claim 8 and Claims that depend thereon. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the §103(a) rejection of Claim 11 and allow issuance thereof.

VI. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant now sees all of the Claims currently pending in this application to be in condition for allowance and therefore earnestly solicits a Notice of Allowance for Claims 1 and 3-20.

The Applicant requests the Examiner to telephone the undersigned agent of record at (972) 480-8800 if such would further or expedite the prosecution of the present application. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees, credits or overpayments to Deposit Account 12-2252.

Respectfully submitted,

HITT GAINES, PC

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Steven J. Hanke". The signature is written in a cursive, slightly slanted style.

Steven J. Hanke
Registration No. 58,076

Dated: October 22, 2008

P.O. Box 832570
Richardson, Texas 75083
(972) 480-8800